

**TOP SECRET**

18 FEB 1970

## MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: NIPE Study: "Intelligence Planning Guidance  
for the 1970's"

1. This paper provides comment on Part Four of the draft NIPE Study "Intelligence Planning Guidance for the 1970's". Detailed comment in the attachment to this memorandum is concerned mainly with suggested changes in the Implications for U.S. Intelligence sections of Parts One, Two and Three of the Study.

2. Part Four should be modified to reflect the following points:

- a. THE REQUIREMENTS PROBLEM. Paragraphs 125 through 133. These paragraphs encounter the semantics difficulty with the word "requirements" that is common in the intelligence community. In the present case the word is used originally to refer to needs of policy makers for intelligence and immediately thereafter to refer to needs for collection. The rapid transition is confusing and the text consequently does not track well. The section should be revised and the words "intelligence collection guidance" substituted for "requirements" where used in the sense of information needs of the intelligence-producing components. Furthermore, the revised section should distinguish between the various roles played by the intelligence guidance that is provided by production components for collectors. As the paper stands now, it highlights exploitation guidance [redacted] as the major form of guidance; it fails to recognize the very important guidance for collection programming as well as the "feedback" evaluations that represent a form of guidance for program review.
- b. ORDERING OF REQUIREMENTS. Paragraphs 128 through 130. These paragraphs credit the CNIO's and the PNIO's with more influence on collection activities than they deserve. In fact, the weight of DCID's 1/2 and 1/3 is minimal at best in collection matters and all reference to them in this connection should be eliminated.

25X1

25X1

**TOP SECRET**

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/05/23 : CIA-RDP82M00531R000800070039-2

TOP SECRET

- c. RESOURCE REVIEW PROGRAMS. Paragraph 142. The recognition of the necessity to develop more orderly means of program review is sound. However, the many proposals for aggregating resource data, information needs, quantified value judgments, etc., on a community-wide basis suggest a time-consuming system-analysis approach similar to but much more formidable than the recommendations in the [ ] ABM Study. All the caveats expressed in the CIA critique of the ABM Study apply with even greater force here.

25X1

-2-

25X1

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/05/23 : CIA-RDP82M00531R000800070039-2

TOP SECRET

25X1

Approved For Release 2005/05/23 : CIA-RDP82M00531R000800070039-2

Next 5 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2005/05/23 : CIA-RDP82M00531R000800070039-2